

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 6-7, and 22-24 remain pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishinaga (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0134988). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, to expedite prosecution, Applicant amends claim 23.

Amended claim 23 calls for a substrate including an upper surface and a lower surface opposite the upper surface. A through hole is provided in the substrate and an optical element is adhered to the lower surface of the substrate. An optical section of the optical element faces the through hole. A lens shaped light transmissive member is mounted in the through hole and an upper end of a side surface of the light transmissive member is recessed within the through hole relative to the upper surface of the substrate.

Referring to Fig. 2 of applicant's specification, the substrate 20 includes an upper surface opposite the wiring 22 and a lower surface adjacent the wiring 22. A through hole 24 is provided in the substrate 20. A lens shaped light transmissive member 40 is mounted in the through hole 24. The lens 40 includes a side surface abutting the substrate 20 within the through hole 24. An upper end of the side surface of the lens 40 is recessed within the through hole 24 relative to the upper surface of the substrate 20. This enables the use of a thinner lens.


In contrast, Ishinaga teaches (see Fig. 4) a substrate 2 encircling an optical element 3. The optical element 3 is not adhered to a lower surface of the substrate 2. Rather, the optical element is supported within an interior volume of the substrate 2 and encased by lens 5. Further, the side surface of the lens 5 is not recessed within the hole relative to the upper surface of the substrate 2. Inasmuch as the optical element 3 is not adhered to a lower surface of the substrate 2, and the side surface of the lens 5 is not recessed within the hole, Ishinaga cannot anticipate the subject matter of claim 23.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb 24, 2004

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
[BEW/cmh]